DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
US ARMY TOXIC AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AGENCY
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MARYLAND 21010-5401

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

May 11, 1990

Installation Restoration Division

ORIGINAL
(Red)

Mr. Henry Sokolowski
Federal Facilities Section
Superfund Branch
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,
Region III
841 Chestnut Building
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

Dear Mr. Sokolowski:

Reference is made to Mr. Lewis D. Walker's letter of April 26, 1990, informing Mr. Stephen R. Wassersug that this Agency would provide you with copies of all completed preliminary assessment reports for Army installations within your Region. These documents are provided at the enclosure.

If you have any further questions, please contact Mr. Conrad Swann, this Agency, at (301) 671-3182.

Sincerely,

Robert J. York
Chief
Installation Restoration Division

Enclosure

Installation Assessment of Fort Story, Virginia
Report No. 184
September 1980

ORIGINAL (Red)

Update of the Initial Installation Assessment of Ft. Story
AMXTH-IR-A-184 (U)
Final Report
September 1988

Installation Assessment of Fort Eustis, Virginia
Report No. 183
March 1982

Update of the Initial Installation Assessment of Fort Eustis
AMXTH-IR-A-183 (U)
Revised Draft
August 1987

Installation Assessment of US Army Engineer Center and Fort Belvoir, Virginia
DRXTH-ES-IA-81-185
Final Report for Period 8-12 September 1980
March 1982

Installation Assessment of the U.S. Army Garrison, Fort Pickett,
Blackstone, VA
Report No. 316B
April 1982

Installation Assessment of the U.S. Army Quartermaster Center and Fort Lee,
Fort Lee, VA
Report No. 316A
April 1982

Installation Assessment of New Cumberland Army Depot
Report No. 131
December 1979

Update of the Installation Reassessment of New Cumberland Army Depot
AMXTH-IR-A-131 (U)
Final Report
January 1988

Installation Assessment of Carlisle Barracks, PA.
Report No. 332
October 1983

ORIGINAL
(Red)

Installation Assessment of Scranton Army Ammunition Plant
Report No. 160
March 1980

Update of the Initial Installation Assessment of Scranton Army Ammunition Plant, Scranton, PA
AMXTH-IR-A-160 (U)
Final Report

Installation Assessment of Hays Army Ammunition Plant
Report No. 143
December 1979

Update of the Initial Installation Assessment of Hays Army Ammunition Plant, Pittsburgh, PA
AMZTH-IR-A-143 (U)

Installation Assessment of Fort Detrick, Maryland Record Evaluation
Report No. 106
Volume I
January 1977

Installation Assessment of Fort George G. Meade, (Including Gaithersburg Research Facility), Maryland
DRXTH-ES-IA-81187
Final Report
June 1982

Update of the Initial Installation Assessment of Fort George G. Meade and Gaithersburg Research Facility
AMXTH-IR-A-187 (U)
Final Report
December 1987

ORIGINAL (Red)

Installation Assessment ERADCOM Activities: Harry Diamond Laboratories, Maryland, Woodbridge Research Facility, Virginia, Blossom Point Field Test Facility, Maryland
Report No. 309A
July 1981

Installation Assessment of Headquarters, Walter Reed Army Medical Center Washington DC and Noncontiguous Sections Forest Glen, Silver Spring, MD and Glen Haven, Wheaton, MD.
Report No. 342
June 1984

Installation Assessment of the Military District of Washington Installations Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington DC; Fort Myer, Arlington, VA; and Cameron Station, Alexandria, VA.
Report No. 343
September 17, 1984

NIKE Site W-94, Rockville, MD
Findings of Fact
Project Number C03MD0248000
13 February 1985

Warrenton Training Center, Warrenton, VA
Site Inspection Report

Historical Summary and Report of Findings of Fort Monroe, VA
July 1979

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, DC 20310

ORIGINAL (Red)

26 APR 1990

Mr. Stephen R. Wassersug
Director
Hazardous Waste Management
Division
U. S. Environmental Protection
Agency, Region III
841 Chestnut Building
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

Dear Mr. Wassersug:

Reference is made to your letter of April 4, 1990, regarding assessment information on 24 properties of concern. I have requested the U. S. Army Toxic and Hazardous Materials Agency (USATHAMA) to forward copies of all completed assessment reports as an initial response (attached listing). These documents may duplicate earlier report submissions by individual installations.

These documents represent the Discovery Phase of the Army's Installation Restoration Program efforts to date and are essential in determining where deficiencies exist based on subsequently published U. S. Environmental Protection Agency guidance. Also, three of the 24 properties listed in your letter are not active Army installations. The appropriate responsible Federal agencies for these are also indicated for your information in the attachment.

As to the schedule for resolving the existing document deficiency issue, USATHAMA has informed me that the installations will have the required information no later than 120 days following an existing contract modification. The modification is scheduled to be awarded on May 1, 1990. The installations will be instructed to forward this information to your office upon approval. Since scheduling of these activities will be at the discretion of the installations and the USATHAMA consultant, no firm schedule of individual site visits or order of resulting reports can be determined at this time.

I trust this information will be of assistance to you. If you have any further questions, I may be reached at (202) 695-7824.

Sincerely,

Lewis D. Walker

Lewis D. Walker
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army
(Environment, Safety and Occupational Health)
OASA(I,L&E)

Attachment

Installation Assessment of Fort Story, Virginia
Report No. 184
September 1980

Update of the Initial Installation Assessment of Ft. Story
AMXTH-IR-A-184 (U)
Final Report
September 1988

Installation Assessment of Fort Eustis, Virginia
Report No. 183
March 1982

Update of the Initial Installation Assessment of Fort Eustis
AMXTH-IR-A-183 (U)
Revised Draft
August 1987

Installation Assessment of US Army Engineer Center and Fort Belvoir, Virginia
DRXTH-ES-IA-81-185
Final Report for Period 8-12 September 1980
March 1982

Installation Assessment of the U.S. Army Garrison, Fort Pickett,
Blackstone, VA
Report No. 316B
April 1982

Installation Assessment of the U.S. Army Quartermaster Center and Fort Lee,
Fort Lee, VA
Report No. 316A
April 1982

Installation Assessment of New Cumberland Army Depot
Report No. 131
December 1979

Update of the Installation Reassessment of New Cumberland Army Depot
AMXTH-IR-A-131 (U)
Final Report
January 1988

ORIGINAL (Red)

Installation Assessment of Carlisle Barracks, PA.
Report No. 332
October 1983

Installation Assessment of Scranton Army Ammunition Plant
Report No. 160
March 1980

Update of the Initial Installation Assessment of Scranton Army Ammunition Plant, Scranton, PA
AMXTH-IR-A-160 (U)
Final Report

Installation Assessment of Hays Army Ammunition Plant
Report No. 143
December 1979

Update of the Initial Installation Assessment of Hays Army Ammunition Plant, Pittsburgh, PA
AMZTH-IR-A-143 (U)

Installation Assessment of Fort Detrick, Maryland Record Evaluation
Report No. 106
Volume I
January 1977

Installation Assessment of Fort George G. Meade, (Including Gaithersburg Research Facility), Maryland
DRXTH-ES-IA-81187
Final Report
June 1982

Update of the Initial Installation Assessment of Fort George G. Meade and Gaithersburg Research Facility
AMXTH-IR-A-187 (U)
Final Report
December 1987

ORIGINAL (Red)

Installation Assessment ERADCOM Activities: Harry Diamond Laboratories, Maryland, Woodbridge Research Facility, Virginia, Blossom Point Field Test Facility, Maryland
Report No. 309A
July 1981

Installation Assessment of Headquarters, Walter Reed Army Medical Center Washington DC and Noncontiguous Sections Forest Glen, Silver Spring, MD and Glen Haven, Wheaton, MD.
Report No. 342
June 1984

Installation Assessment of the Military District of Washington Installations Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington DC; Fort Myer, Arlington, VA; and Cameron Station, Alexandria, VA.
Report No. 343
September 17, 1984

NIKE Site W-94, Rockville, MD
Findings of Fact
Project Number C03MD0248000
13 February 1985

Warrenton Training Center, Warrenton, VA
Site Inspection Report

Historical Summary and Report of Findings of Fort Monroe, VA
July 1979

NON-ARMY PROPERTIES

District of Columbia

Soldiers and Airmens Home - An independent agency of the Federal Government

Virginia

Camp Peary - U.S. Navy Property

John Kerr Reservoir - Civil Works, Wilmington District, Corps of Engineers

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION III

841 Chestnut Building
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

VA0 2137209 31

DAVID FOLEY
DEPARTMENT OF ARMY
Fort Pickett, VA
FORT PICKETT
BLACKSTONE,, VA 23824

NOV 0 0 1987

Re: Federal Agency Hazardous Waste Compliance Docket

Dear DAVID FOLEY:

Section 120 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) directed the Administrator of the EPA to establish a Federal Agency Hazardous Waste Compliance Docket. By April 1988 agencies must submit to EPA information required to complete a hazard ranking score (HRS) for of each facility on the docket. That information includes a Preliminary Assessment (PA) and a Site Inspection (SI). By April 1989 EPA must determine which facilities should be placed on the national priorities list (NPL). Once a facility is listed on the NPL, the agency must begin a remedial investigation and feasibility study within 6 months and must undertake "substantial continuous" remedial action within 15 months of the feasibility study's completion.

Although the Docket has not been published in the Federal Register, the deadline for submission of the hazard ranking information remains April 1988. Facilities which have submitted information to EPA under sections 3005, 3010, or 3016 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, or section 103 of Superfund will be included in the docket. Your facility will be included on the Docket.

Enclosed is a copy of the EPA Potential Hazardous Waste Site PA form, the EPA SI form, and a user's manual for the Hazardous Waste Site Ranking System. The completed PA and SI forms should be returned to Region III by April 17, 1988. Department of Defense Installation Restoration Program reports may be submitted in lieu of, or in addition to the forms if the reports contain all the information EPA will require to complete the HRS.

Based on the findings of the PA, your agency may determine that no further actions are required. If this is the case, the PA report should be submitted to the EPA and to the State. EPA will review the report and concur or not concur with the determination. If EPA and the State agree that no further action is required, the information will be entered into the docket. If EPA does not agree, you will be notified that more information is needed for the HRS evaluation.

General questions regarding the Docket should be referred to :

Steven Hirsh (3HW17)
US EPA Region III
841 Chestnut Bldg.
Philadelphia, PA 19107
(215) 597-0549

Questions related to the Preliminary Assessment and Site Inspection should be referred to:

Robert Panabianco (3HW23)
US EPA Region III
841 Chestnut Bldg.
Philadelphia, PA 19107
(215) 597-8333

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Steven R Hirsh

Steven R. Hirsh
Docket Coordinator

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Region III - 6th & Walnut Sts.

Philadelphia, Pa. 19106

ORIGINAL (Red)

SUBJECT: Review of IRP Report for Fort Pickett

DATE: ~~OCT 1 4 1985~~ FEB 14, 85

FROM: Francis J. Mulhern F.J.M.
Federal Facilities Compliance Coordinator (3ES00)

TO: Stephen R. Wassersug, Director
Hazardous Waste Management Division (3HW00)

Attached please find the Phase I IRP report for Fort Pickett, Virginia. The report states that no off-post migration of contamination was indicated. However, I believe a review of this report is still appropriate due to our unique overview responsibility over our sister Federal agencies.

Attachment

cc: Stan Laskowski (3RA00)
Greene Jones (3ES00)

VA-102

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Region III – 6th & Walnut Sts.

Philadelphia, Pa. 19106

JCFCEELIS - 2/85

SUBJECT: Review of IRP Report for Fort Pickett **DATE:** ~~OCT 14 1984~~ FEB 14,85

FROM: Francis J. Mulhern F.J.M.
Federal Facilities Compliance Coordinator (3ES00)

ORIGINAL (Red)

TO: Stephen R. Wassersug, Director
Hazardous Waste Management Division (3HW00)

Attached please find the Phase I IRP report for Fort Pickett, Virginia. The report states that no off-post migration of contamination was indicated. However, I believe a review of this report is still appropriate due to our unique overview responsibility over our sister Federal agencies.

Attachment

cc: Stan Laskowski (3RA00)
Greene Jones (3ES00)

Ed Sproles

FJ: Lorie

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION III
841 Chestnut Building
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

ORIGINAL
(Red)

SUBJECT: Review of IRP Report for Fort Pickett

DATE: MAR 18 1985

FROM: Edmund J. Skernolis, Chief
Site Investigation & Support (3HW23)

TO: Francis J. Mulhern
Federal Facilities Coordinator (3ES00)

THRU: Thomas C. Voltaggio, Chief
Superfund Branch (3HW20)

I have completed the review of the Fort Pickett IRP Report as you requested. Since this installation generates, stores, and disposes such a small amount of hazardous material and no evidence of off-site contamination exists, I agree with the conclusion that no confirmation study is needed at this time. However, I would like to suggest that a follow-up study be initiated to determine whether the recommendations suggested in this assessment were effectively implemented.

Please keep me informed of any further developments which may occur at the Fort Pickett US Army Garrison.

cc: D. Carney (3HW00)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY Mr. Foley/mr/(804) 292-2630
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY GARRISON, FORT PICKETT
BLACKSTONE, VIRGINIA 23824

January 24, 1985

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

Directorate of Engineering and Housing

ORIGINAL
(Red)

Mr. Fran Mulhern (3ES00)
US Environmental Protection Agency
Region III
Sixth and Walnut Streets
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106

Dear Mr. Mulhern:

Enclosed is a copy of the Installation Assessment of the US Army Garrison, Fort Pickett, Blackstone, Virginia.

This report is provided in accordance with instructions by US Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), Environmental and Natural Resources Division.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

Clarence L. Kesler

CLARENCE L. KESLER
DIRECTOR, DPCA

Enclosure

Copy furnished:
Cdr, TRADOC, ATTN: ATEN-FN, Fort Monroe, VA wo encl

NUS CORPORATION
392 OLD EAGLE SCHOOL ROAD
SUITE 916
WAYNE, PENNSYLVANIA 19087
(215) 687-9510

ORIGINAL (Red)

May 2, 1983
C-585-3-5-4

TDD Nos.: F3-8302-75
F3-8302-83
F3-8212-34
F3-8212-36
F3-8302-77

Linda Young Boornazian
Environmental Protection Agency
Curtis Building
Sixth and Walnut Streets
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106

Dear Ms. Boornazian;

The Preliminary Assessments for the above referenced Military Facilities are presently on hold. As was discussed with you and F. Mulhern, the EPA III Federal Facilities Coordinator, Military studies of these facilities are scheduled for release this fiscal year. After these studies are made available, NUS FIT III will review the Military's findings and prepare a Preliminary Assessment as tasked.

Presently no new due date for the completion of the subject Technical Directive Documents can be projected. However Mr. Mulhern has indicated that the Military reports are due out in May 1983.

If you have any questions please feel free to call.

Respectfully,

Garth Glenn
Assistant Regional
Project Manager

GG/aa
CC: D. Senovich
T. Shannon
D. Walker
J. Daley

Fort Pickett

The sources of information reviewed to complete the attached deficiency checklist include:

- Installation Assessment Report of the U.S. Army Garrison, Fort Pickett, Blackstone, Virginia. April 1982.

PA DEFICIENCY CHECKLIST

Rec #: 7

EPA ID # VA2210020705
Federal Facility ID # VA2210020705
Facility Name Fort Pickett

City Blackstone State: VA

		INFORMATION IS PROVIDED? Y/N	INFORMATION IS ACCEPTABLE? Y/N
1.	OVERVIEW/SITE HISTORY		
1A.	Describe site operations (manufacturing, storage, waste disposal practices, etc.) include the following:	N	N
1A1.	History of site/years in operation	Y	N
1A2.	Topographic map of surrounding area	N	N
1A3.	Site map or sketch	N	N
1A4.	Regulatory history of site (i.e. RCRA site, CERCLA site, NPDES permits, etc.)	N	N
1B.	Describe any emergency or remedial actions that have occurred at the site	N	N
1C.	Describe any releases of wastes to groundwater, surface water, or air	N	N
1D.	Give the following population information:		
1D1.	0 - 1/4 mile from site	N	N
1D2.	1/4 - 1/2 mile from site	N	N
1D3.	1/2 - 1 miles from site	N	N
1D4.	1 - 2 miles from site	N	N
1D5.	2 - 3 miles from site	N	N
1D6.	3 - 4 miles from site	N	N
1E.	Describe any prior spills that occurred at the site	Y	Y
1F.	Describe site security (e.g., fences monitoring, patrols, gates, etc.)	N	N
2.	WASTE/SOURCE INFORMATION (see December 23, 1988, Federal Register, 52016-52017)		
2A.	Describe as specifically as possible the types of wastes produced at the site and the methods in which these wastes were treated, stored, or disposed	N	N
2B.	Describe as specifically as possible the amount (volume, weight, etc.) of each waste type produced at the site	N	N

PA DEFICIENCY CHECKLIST

		INFORMATION IS PROVIDED? Y/N	ACCEPTABLE? Y/N
2C.	Describe each waste management unit (e.g., landfill) on-site	N	N
2D.	Describe as specifically as possible the amount of waste treated, stored, or disposed in each waste management unit on-site (e.g., landfills, impoundments, tanks, etc.)	Y	Y
2E.	Describe as specifically as possible the condition/ integrity of each waste management unit (e.g., are landfills equipped with liners or caps)	N	N
2F.	Describe any secondary containment features/ structures associated with each waste management unit (e.g., precipitation run-on and run-off systems, leachate collection systems, gas collection systems	N	N
2G.	Describe the size/volume/capacity of each waste management unit	N	N
3.	GROUNDWATER PATHWAY INFORMATION (see December 23, 1988, Federal Register, 52020-52037)		
3A.	Determine if the groundwater within 4 miles of the site is used for any of the following purposes:		
3A1.	private or public drinking water source	Y	N
3A2.	commercial	N	N
3A3.	irrigation (5 acre minimum)	N	N
3A4.	industrial	N	N
3A5.	not used, but usable	N/A	n/A
3A6.	unusable	N/A	N/A
3B.	Identify the nearest well within 4 miles of the site that is a source of drinking water	N	N
3C.	Provide a map (or sketch) locating all drinking water wells within a 4-mile area of the site	N	N
3D.	Descibe the population that drinks groundwater drawn from wells within 4 miles of the site	N	N

ORIGINAL (Red)

PA DEFICIENCY CHECKLIST

		INFORMATION PROVIDED? Y/N	INFORMATION IS ACCEPTABLE? Y/N
3E.	Describe known or probable groundwater flow direction	N	N
3F.	Describe, as precisely as possible, the geology and hydrogeology of the site area (including formation names, thickness, types of material and depth from surface, soils	N	N
3G.	Discuss any evidence of aquitards between aquifers within 4 miles of the site	N	N
3H.	Describe any evidence of interconnections between the uppermost aquifer and aquifers used for drinking water supply within 4 miles of the site	N	N
3I.	Estimate annual net precipitation at the site	N	N
3J.	Discuss soil or geologic conditions that might inhibit or facilitate groundwater migration	Y	Y
3K.	Identify if any underlying aquifers are "sole source" as designated by Section 1424(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act	N	N
3L.	Determine if site is located in an area of Karst terrain	N	N
4.	SURFACE WATER PATHWAY INFORMATION (see December 23, 1988, Federal Register, 52037-52062)		
4A.	Describe surface water bodies within 15 miles of the site or provide a map	Y	N
4B.	Discuss the probable surface runoff pattern from the site to surface waters, including the distance to the nearest body of surface water, or provide a map	Y	N
4C.	Describe the points at the site where hazardous substances begin to migrate and their probable point of entry into a surface water body	Y	N
4D.	Identify if surface water drawn from intakes within 15 miles from the probable point of entry is used for any of the following purposes:	N	N

PA DEFICIENCY CHECKLIST

		INFORMATION IS PROVIDED? Y/N	INFORMATION IS ACCEPTABLE? Y/N
4D1.	commercial livestock watering	N	N
4D2.	commercial food preparation	N	N
4D3.	commercial industrial purposes other than drinking water, recreation, or fishery uses	N	N
4E.	Identify the nature and size of any of the following targets associated with surface water bodies within 15 miles downstream of the probable point of entry	N	N
4E1.	population served by intakes of drinking water	N	N
4E2.	population associated with recreational use	N	N
4E3.	sensitive environments (including wetlands [5 acre minimum] and critical habitats of a federally endangered species)	N	N
4E4.	economically important resources (e.g., shellfish)	N	N
4F.	Discuss any qualitative, quantitative, or circumstantial evidence of contamination of surface waters caused by management hazardous substances on-site	Y	Y
4G.	Estimate the size of the upgradient drainage area from the site	N	N
4H.	Determine the 2-year, 24-hour rainfall for the site	N	N
4I.	Discuss the average annual stream-flow associated with surface water within 15 miles of the site	N	N
4J.	Discuss if fisheries (recreational or commercial) exist in surface water bodies within 15 miles of the site	N	N
4J1.	describe production rate of fisheries	N	N
5.	AIR PATHWAY INFORMATION (see December 23, 1988, Federal Register, 52005-52022)		
5A.	Describe if there has been an observed release of a hazardous substance to the atmosphere	N	N
5B.	Determine the shortest distance to the closest residence or regularly occupied building or area from any on-site air emission source	N	N

PA DEFICIENCY CHECKLIST

		INFORMATION IS PROVIDED? Y/N	INFORMATION IS ACCEPTABLE? Y/N
5C.	Describe the following types of land use near the site, and indicate their distance from any on-site emission source:	N	N
5C1.	commercial/industrial/institutional	N	N
5C2.	single family residential	N	N
5C3.	multi-family residential	N	N
5C4.	parks	N	N
5C5.	prime agricultural	N	N
5C6.	non-prime agricultural	N	N
5D.	Determine if sensitive environments are within 4 miles of an on-site emission source	N	N
	ON SITE INFORMATION (see December 23, 1988, Federal Register, 52062-52070)		
6A.	Describe any areas of contamination that are within 2 feet of ground surface	N	N
6B.	Provide the number of children under seven years old living, attending school or daycare where contamination is less than 2 feet of ground surface	N/A	N/A
6C.	Describe the measures taken to limit access to areas with contamination (e.g., fences, guards, etc.):	N	N

/e

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Region III
841 Chestnut Building
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

ORIGINAL (Red)

COL RONALD SCHMIDT
COMMANDING OFFICER
USAG
FT. PICKETT
AFZA-FP-C
BLACKSTONE, VA 23824-5000

Re: FORT PICKETT Compliance with CERCLA Section 120

Dear COL. RONALD B. SCHMIDT:

As I am sure you are aware, your facility has been listed on the Federal Agency Hazardous Waste Compliance Docket (the docket) as of 02/12/88 in accordance with the requirements of Section 120 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). EPA requires that all such facilities must submit to EPA a preliminary assessment (PA) within 18 months of being listed on the docket. The PA must provide data that will sufficiently allow EPA to evaluate the facility with the Hazard Ranking System (HRS) for potential listing on the National Priorities List (NPL).

To date, EPA has the following documents for your facility to support the PA requirement:

- Advanced Sciences, Inc., November 21, 1990, Preliminary Responses for Ft. Pickett, Backstone, Virginia.
- Environmental Science and Engineering, April 1982, Installation Assessment of the U.S. Army, Garrison, Ft. Pickett, Backstone, Virginia.

EPA has reviewed all of the above documents in view of the data requirements of the revised HRS (55 FR 51532), but has determined that some data provided by the documents are deficient. Enclosed is an HRS scoring checklist that indicates which areas are deficient and therefore need to be addressed.

Although EPA Region III recognizes that the HRS is new and complex for many users, the statutory deadlines of CERCLA still must be met. In fact, EPA is currently under a court order to evaluate the docket facilities as a result of a recent lawsuit by the Conservation Law Foundation.

ORIGINAL
(Red)

To assist facilities in preparing the PAs, EPA Region III is conducting a 2-day conference in Annapolis, Maryland on June 19 through 20, 1991. The first day of the conference will include in-depth discussion on the new HRS as it relates to federal facilities. A draft agenda is enclosed. You should have already received a formal invitation to the conference. By sending this followup letter, it is our hope that technical representatives from your facility (those directly responsible for preparing the PA) will attend at least the 1-day HRS session and come prepared to discuss the unique characteristics of your facility. EPA has designed the session so that we can answer some of the specific questions that relate to your facility.

As always, if you have any technical questions regarding the enclosed material, please call Ms. Lisa Cunningham at (215) 597-0984.

Sincerely,

Henry J. Sokolowski
Chief, Federal Facilities Section

cc: DAVID FOLEY, DEPUTY & ENVIRONMENTAL ENG., USAG FT. PICKETT, AFZA-FP-E

Enclosures

- Deficiency checklist
- Draft agenda

HRS SCORING DEFICIENCY CHECKLIST

Rec #: 112

ORIGINAL (Red)

EPA ID # VA2210020705
Federal Facility ID # VAD213720705
Facility Name FORT PICKETT

City BLACKSTONE State VA Zip 23824

		INFORMATION PROVIDED? Y/N	INFORMATION IS ACCEPTABLE? Y/N*
1.	**OVERVIEW/SITE HISTORY**		
1A.	Reports submitted to EPA are referenced and copies of each reference are provided.	N	—
1B.	Describe facility operations (manufacturing, storage, waste disposal practices, etc.) including the following:	Y	Y
1B1.	History of the facility and sources (any area containing or potentially containing hazardous substances).	—	—
1B2.	A topographic map with a 4-mile radius drawn around each source.	—	—
1B3.	A facility and source location map and sketch.	—	—
1B4.	Regulatory history of the facility (e.g., RCRA facility, TSCA, CERCLA, NPDES permits, etc.).	—	—
1C.	Describe any emergency response actions or interim remedial actions that have occurred at the facility. Description should include amount of materials removed, disposal location, and sample analytical results prior and subsequent to removal.	Y	Y
1D.	Describe any release of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants to ground water, surface water, soil, or air and provide sampling results with detection limits, laboratory methods, and quality assurance procedures.	Y	N
1E.	Give the following population within each radius indicated below. Each radius should begin at the center of each source if the source is small or at the outer edge if the source is large. Count population in overlapping areas only once.	Y	Y
1E1.	0 - 1/4 mile	—	—
1E2.	1/4 - 1/2 mile	—	—
1E3.	1/2 - 1 mile	—	—
1E4.	1 - 2 mile	—	—
1E5.	2 - 3 mile	—	—
1E6.	3 - 4 mile	—	—

* Where information is provided but not acceptable, see attachment for a detailed explanation of why the information is not acceptable.

HRS SCORING DEFICIENCY CHECKLIST

ORIGINAL (Red)

Facility Name FORT PICKETT

		INFORMATION PROVIDED?	INFORMATION IS ACCEPTABLE?
		Y/N	Y/N
1F.	Describe any prior spills (e.g., quantity of the spill, hazardous substances) that occurred at the facility.	Y	N
1G.	Describe facility and source security and access (e.g., fences, patrols, gates, etc.).	Y	Y
2.	**WASTE/SOURCE INFORMATION (see Section 2 of the HRS Final Rule - December 1990 Federal Register)**		
2A.	Describe as specifically as possible the types of wastes produced at the facility and the methods in which these wastes were treated, stored, or disposed.	Y	Y
2B.	Describe as specifically as possible the amount (volume, weight, etc.) of each waste type produced and the form in which it was discharged or disposed (e.g., solid, liquid) at the facility.	Y	Y
2C.	Describe each source type (e.g., landfill) located within the facility boundary.	Y	Y
2D.	Describe as specifically as possible the constituents (concentrations of individual constituents) of each waste type disposed in each source.	Y	Y
2E.	Describe as specifically as possible the amount of waste treated, stored, or disposed of in each source (e.g., landfills, impoundments, tanks).	Y	Y
2F.	Determine the depth at which wastes were deposited in each source.	N	___
2G.	Describe as specifically as possible the condition/integrity of each source (e.g., Do landfills have liners or caps?).	Y	N
2H.	Describe any secondary containment features/structures associated with each source (e.g., precipitation runon and runoff systems, leachate collection systems, gas collection systems).	Y	Y
2I.	Describe the size, volume, capacity, and area of each source.	Y	N
3.	**GROUND-WATER PATHWAY INFORMATION (see Section 3 of the HRS Final Rule - December 1990 Federal Register)**		
3A.	Determine if the ground water within a 4-mile radius of each source is used for any of the following purposes and locate the wells on a map. Each radius should begin at the center of each source if the source is small or at the outer edge if it is large. Provide the depth of each well.	Y	N

* Where information is provided but not acceptable, see attachment for a detailed explanation of why the information is not acceptable.

HRS SCORING DEFICIENCY CHECKLIST

ORIGINAL (Red)

Facility Name FORT PICKETT

		INFORMATION PROVIDED? Y/N	INFORMATION IS ACCEPTABLE? Y/N*
3A1.	private or public drinking-water source	Y	Y
3A2.	irrigation of commercial food or commercial forage crops (include acres)	Y	N
3A3.	commercial livestock watering	Y	N
3A4.	commercial aquaculture	Y	N
3A5.	water for major or designated recreational area, excluding drinking-water use	N	N
3A6.	standby wells used for drinking water at least once a year	N	N
3B.	Outline the public water distribution system within a 4-mile radius of each source on a topographic map.	Y	Y
3C.	Identify the nearest drinking-water well within a 4-mile radius of each source.	Y	N
3D.	Determine the population (including workers, students, and residents) drawing from each drinking-water well within the following radii. Each radius should start at the center of each source if the source is small, or at the outer edge if it is large. Count population in overlapping areas only once.	N	___
3D1.	0 - 1/4 mile	___	___
3D2.	1/4 - 1/2 mile	___	___
3D3.	1/2 - 1 mile	___	___
3D4.	1 - 2 mile	___	___
3D5.	2 - 3 mile	___	___
3D6.	3 - 4 mile	___	___
3E.	Describe known or probable ground-water flow direction from each source.	Y	Y
3F.	Describe as specifically as possible the geology and hydrogeology of the facility area (including geological formation name, thickness, types of material, hydraulic conductivities, and depth to aquifers); provide references.	Y	N
3G.	Discuss any evidence of aquitards and discontinuities between aquifers within a 4-mile radius of each source.	Y	N
3H.	Describe any evidence of interconnections between the uppermost aquifer and lower aquifers within 2 miles of each source.	Y	N
3I.	Estimate annual net precipitation at the facility.	Y	Y
3J.	Discuss soil or geologic conditions that might inhibit or facilitate ground-water migration.	Y	Y

* Where information is provided but not acceptable, see attachment for a detailed explanation of why the information is not acceptable.

HRS SCORING DEFICIENCY CHECKLIST

Facility Name FORT PICKETT

		INFORMATION PROVIDED? Y/N	INFORMATION IS ACCEPTABLE? Y/N*
3K.	Determine if sources are located in an area of Karst terrain.	Y	Y
3L.	Provide results from ground-water sampling of aquifers underlying the sources and from domestic wells (drinking water) within 2 miles of each source.	N	___
3M.	Provide results from background ground-water sampling of aquifers underlying the sources.	N	___
3N.	Determine if any areas within a 4-mile radius of each source are located in a Wellhead Protection Area according to Section 1428 of the Safe Drinking Water Act.	N	___
4.	**SURFACE-WATER PATHWAY INFORMATION (see Section 4 of the HRS Final Rule - December 1990 Federal Register)**		
4A.	Describe surface-water bodies 0 to 15 miles downstream of each source and provide a map of surface-water bodies receiving drainage from each source.	Y	Y
4B.	Discuss the probable surface runoff pattern from each source to surface waters, including the distance to the nearest surface-water body; provide a map.	Y	Y
4C.	Describe the point(s) at each source where hazardous substances begin to migrate and their probable point(s) of entry into a surface-water body (including ponds, lakes, streams, etc.).	Y	Y
4D.	Identify if surface water drawn from intakes within 15 miles downstream of the probable point of entry is used for any of the following purposes:	N	___
4D1.	irrigation (5-acre minimum) of commercial food or commercial forage crops	___	___
4D2.	watering of commercial livestock	___	___
4D3.	ingredient in commercial food preparation	___	___
4D4.	major or designated water recreation area, excluding drinking water	___	___
4E.	Identify the following targets associated with surface-water bodies 0 to 15 miles downstream of the probable point of entry:	N	___
4E1.	population (residents, workers, and students) served by intakes of drinking water	___	___

* Where information is provided but not acceptable, see attachment for a detailed explanation of why the information is not acceptable.

HRS SCORING DEFICIENCY CHECKLIST

Facility Name FORT PICKETT

		INFORMATION IS PROVIDED? Y/N (Red)	ACCEPTABLE? Y/N*
4E2.	sensitive environments (see Table 4-23, December 1990 Federal Register) and critical habitats for federally endangered or threatened species	___	___
4E3.	economically important resources (e.g., shellfish)	___	___
4E4.	any portion of the surface water designated by a state for drinking-water use under Section 305(a) of the Clean Water Act; or any portion of surface water usable for drinking water	___	___
4F.	Determine the miles of wetlands (wetland frontage) along surface-water bodies 0 to 15 miles downstream from the probable point of entry (see 40 CFR section 230.3).	N	___
4G.	Provide results from sampling of wetlands and/or sensitive environments 0 to 15 miles downstream of each source.	N	___
4H.	Discuss any qualitative, quantitative, or circumstantial evidence of contamination of surface waters from sources.	N	___
4I.	Provide results from sediment and surface-water sampling for points 0 to 15 miles downstream of each source.	N	___
4J.	Provide results from background sediment and surface-water sampling.	N	___
4K.	Provide results from sampling of surface-water intakes 0 to 15 miles downstream of each source.	N	___
4L.	Estimate the size of the upgradient drainage area for each source.	Y	Y
4M.	Determine the 2-year, 24-hour rainfall for the site.	Y	Y
4N.	Discuss the average annual streamflow associated with each surface-water body located 0 to 15 miles downstream of each source.	N	___
4O.	Determine surface soil types at the facility.	Y	Y
4P.	Determine if sources are located in a 1-year, 10-year, 100-year, or 500-year flood plain.	N	___
4Q.	Discuss fisheries (recreational or commercial) in surface-water bodies 0 to 15 miles downstream of each source:	N	___
4Q1.	Describe annual production (in pounds) of human food chain organisms (e.g., trout, shellfish, snapping turtles, crabs) per acre of streams and rivers 0 to 15 miles downstream of each source.	___	___

* Where information is provided but not acceptable, see attachment for a detailed explanation of why the information is not acceptable.

HRS SCORING DEFICIENCY CHECKLIST

ORIGINAL (Red)

Facility Name FORT PICKETT

		INFORMATION PROVIDED? Y/N	ACCEPTABLE? Y/N*
4Q2.	Describe annual production (in pounds) of human food chain organisms (e.g., trout, shellfish, snapping turtles, crabs) per acre of ponds, lakes, bays, or oceans 0 to 15 miles downstream of each source.	___	___
4R.	Identify closed fisheries 0 to 15 miles downstream of each source.	N	___
4S.	Provide results from sampling of human food chain organism tissues in streams and rivers 0 to 15 miles downstream of each source and in ponds, lakes, and bays that receive drainage from the sources.	N	___
5.	**AIR PATHWAY INFORMATION (see Section 6 of the HRS Final Rule - December 1990 Federal Register)**		
5A.	Describe if there has been an observed release (i.e., visual or analytical evidence) of a hazardous substance to the atmosphere.	Y	Y
5B.	Determine the shortest distance to the closest residence or regularly occupied building or area from any on-site source.	Y	Y
5C.	Determine if any of the following resources are located within a 1/2-mile radius of each source	N	___
5C1.	commercial agriculture	___	___
5C2.	commercial silviculture	___	___
5C3.	major or designated recreation area	___	___
5D.	Determine if sensitive environments are within a 4-mile radius of each source.	N	___
5E.	Determine the total area of wetlands within a 4-mile radius of each source.	N	___
6.	**SOIL-EXPOSURE PATHWAY INFORMATION (see Section 5 of the HRS Final Rule - December 1990 Federal Register)**		
6A.	Describe any areas of contamination that are within 2 feet of the ground surface; provide the areal extent of contamination.	Y	Y
6B.	Provide locations and depths of soil samples and results.	N	___
6C.	Provide results of background soil sampling.	N	___

* Where information is provided but not acceptable, see attachment for a detailed explanation of why the information is not acceptable.

HRS SCORING DEFICIENCY CHECKLIST

ORIGINAL (Red)

Facility Name FORT PICKETT

		INFORMATION PROVIDED? Y/N	INFORMATION IS ACCEPTABLE? Y/N*
6D.	Describe the measures taken to limit access to areas with soil contamination within 2 feet of the surface (e.g., fences, security guards).	Y	Y
6E.	Determine if any of the following are located near or within an area of soil contamination (within 2 feet of the surface); provide the number of individuals for 6E1 and 6E2:	N	—
6E1.	within 200 feet of any residences, schools, or day care centers and within the property boundary	—	—
6E2.	within 200 feet of the work place area and within a work place property boundary	—	—
6E3.	within boundaries of commercial agriculture, silviculture, livestock production, or grazing area	—	—
6E4.	within boundaries of a terrestrial-sensitive environment (see Table 5-5, December 1990 Federal Register)	—	—
6F.	Determine the number of individuals who live, work, or attend school within the following distances of soil contamination (within 2 feet of the surface).	N	—
6F1.	0 - 1/4 mile radius	—	—
6F2.	1/4 - 1/2 mile radius	—	—
6F3.	1/2 - 1 mile radius	—	—

* Where information is provided but not acceptable, see attachment for a detailed explanation of why the information is not acceptable.

HRS Scoring Deficiency Checklist Attachment

ORIGINAL (Red)

Fort Pickett (Blackstone, VA)

The sources of information EPA reviewed to complete the attached deficiency checklist are provided in the cover letter.

In cases where information was provided to EPA but is not acceptable, EPA has provided an explanation below. The number and letter adjacent to the explanation correspond to the number and letter that appear on the HRS Scoring Deficiency Checklist.

1D. - Provide sampling results for ground-water samples obtained from the closed landfill (No. 2) and the current landfill.

1F. - Provide sampling results and quantity of PCB spills.

2G. - Provide information on the amount (i.e., depth) of soil covering each landfill.

2I. - Provide information on the volume of each landfill.

3A. - Provide the locations of all wells within a 4-mile radius of each source, on a topographic map.

3A2. to 3A5. - Provide the locations of wells within a 4-mile radius of each source, on a topographic map.

3C. - According to the Preliminary Assessment Response, the closest well (No. 16) to the facility's sources is 0.75 miles from the center point of the study area (Response Number 3A1). The same well is cited in Response Number 3B as the closest private well, 2.3 miles north of the facility. Please address this discrepancy. Please identify all wells used by Fort Pickett on the topographic map.

3F. - Provide the depth to the aquifer of concern (used for drinking water). The depths of private wells and Fort Pickett wells should be included.

3G. and 3H. - According to Preliminary Assessment Response number 3G, no aquitards are known to exist in the study area. Response number 3H indicates that no interconnections are known within the study area. If there are no interconnections between the aquifers, there should be an aquitard. Provide well logs for the wells on the facility to depict geology and hydrogeology in the vicinity of the facility.